



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

North Planning Committees Meeting Report
Wednesday, March 02, 2000 8:30 AM

Napa Valley Marriott
3425 Solano Avenue
Napa, CA

ATTENDEES: NORTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS: PRESENT: Mr. Mike Courtney Sheriff Robert Doyle Hon. Michael Nail Mr. Anthony Tyrrell ABSENT: Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Mr. Gary Freeman GUESTS	CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Ms. Jill Kuper, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Dan Smith, Dan Smith and Associates TASK FORCE STAFF: Ms. Patricia Bonderud, Facilities Planner, AOC
---	---

I. OPENING REMARKS

Sheriff Doyle welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting shortly after 8:00.

II. OLD BUSINESS

The Minutes from Committee Mtg. #1 in Marin are to be revised. As issued, minutes imply that the committee is pre-selecting a specific option for implementation, rather than providing review and comment on the findings of the survey on a county-by-county basis, and options identified to address current and future needs. ***Neither the Committees, or the Task Force as a whole intends to pre-select any option or action as part of the planning effort. After review, all options will be forwarded to the local Court and County Administration for review and comment. Based on this review and comment, the Task Force will formulate an overall approach to addressing statewide needs, using the individual county studies and commentary received as a basis for formulating and prioritizing capital facilities needs..***

III. MEETING SCHEDULE

The next committee meeting will occur on April 5th in Vallejo. Committee meeting #4 is to be held in conjunction with the Task Force meeting #11.

III. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Andy Cupples and Kathleen Halaszynski presented an overview of the current facilities, comparing the state of existing facilities to future needs for the following counties:

Amador County (Presented by Andy Cupples)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Amador County Courthouse
 - Physical rating for the facility was 34.02% or Deficient
 - Functional rating for the facility was 12.5% or Deficient.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth by the year 2020
 - Caseload projected to grow from 12,912 to 24,341.
 - Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 3.4 to 5.4.
- Reuse of Existing Facilities
 - Facility warrants replacement based on physical and functional condition
 - Courtroom located in adjacent building should be consolidated with the main courthouse for operational efficiencies.
 - Existing site offers limited opportunities for expansion both for buildings and parking, as well as restriction due to Indian burial ground.

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Renovation of County Hospital
 - Proceed with renovating county-owned hospital as new court facility.
- Option #2 – New Construction
 - Construct new 5-courtroom facility with administrative support space on another site.

Comments:

- Dan Smith – smaller counties often put the DA and PD into space not required for court use and move them out later when the court needs the space and expands.
- Mike Courtney – how do we factor in the different land cost when considering new construction. A. Cupples indicated that acquisition and land costs are currently excluded from the model. Mike Courtney offered to explore development of unit cost model for land based on state data.
- Dan Smith suggests that we use three categories for land (dense urban, suburban/valley and rural/agricultural).

Actions:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review.

Lassen County (Presented by Andy Cupples)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Historical Courthouse, Susanville

- Facility lacks separate, private and secure circulation, no security screening and insufficient public amenities.
- Electrical and communication technology systems are inadequate. Mechanical system is inadequate to handle the capacity.
- Barkley Justice Center, Susanville
 - Congestion in the courtroom waiting and clerk's public queuing.
 - Water damage from hydrostatic leakage from below.
 - Clerk's counter not-ADA accessible
 - Inadequate mechanical and electrical system.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth by the year 2020
 - Caseload projected to grow from 10,283 to 20,306.
 - Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 2.6 to 3.4.
- Geography: Moderately sized County
- Commitment to Access to Courts
- Reuse of Existing Facilities
 - Courthouse Annex warrants abandonment by courts based on physical and functional condition
 - Existing site with demolition of jail provides opportunity to develop a new functional court facility.

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Centralize Court on Site
 - Construct a new three-courtroom facility adjacent to the Courthouse Annex. Demolish old jail and continue to use courtroom in historic courthouse. Provide linkage between new court facility and historic courthouse for continued use of courtroom.

Actions:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting the option and forward to County for review

Modoc County (Presented by Andy Cupples)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Historical Courthouse, Alturas
 - Physical rating for the facility was 49.94% or Marginal.
 - Functional rating for the facility was 81.25% or Adequate.
- Barkley Justice Center, Alturas
 - Physical rating for the facility was 87.11% or Adequate.
 - Functional rating for the facility was 100% or Adequate.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth by the year 2020
 - Caseload projected to grow from 3,849 to 7,333.
 - Judicial FTE's are not expecting growth.
- Geography: Moderately sized county
- Commitment to access to courts
- Judiciary satisfied with functional and operational issues of courthouse, and can continue to operate from both facilities
- Caseload may only justify one judicial position with unification, therefore only requiring one courtroom – significant reduction in shortfalls

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – “Status Quo”
 - Use Barkley Justice Center as primary court facility; Use historic courtroom for overflow/ceremonial issues; Additions & alteration as required to address shortfalls.

Comments:

- Mike Courtney – Could the historical courthouse be made accessible?
- Andy Cupples – It could be made accessible, but survey indicated that community is keen on accurate preservation. Also, DMJM Consultant team is currently researching the historical code regarding this issue to determine if this is required if acceptable alternate facilities are provided.

Actions:

- Consultant team needs to develop a second option. Add to the second option that the Historical Courthouse is to be made accessible.
- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review.

Siskiyou County (Presented by Andy Cupples)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- Yreka Court Facility
- Family Law Court, Yreka
- Happy Camp Court Facility
- Weed Court Facility
- Dorris Court Facility
- Tulelake Court Facility

The key evaluation issues include:

- No private or secure circulation, no building security, court components functionally scattered, inadequate public resources.
- Non-ADA compliant, no air conditioning, inadequate electrical/communication system and inadequate life safety systems.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth
 - Caseload projected to grow from 22,061 to 32,747 by the year 2020.
 - Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 5.6 to 7.4 over the same horizon.

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Maximum Reuse
 - Construct new 5-courtroom facility in Yreka, demolish existing courthouse and restore historic courthouse.
 - Maintain operation of Family Court in lease space
 - Continue to lease facilities in Weed and Tulelake
- Option #2 – Partial Consolidation
 - Abandon leased Family court facility and demolish existing courthouse and construct new 6-courtroom facility. Renovate Yreka historic courthouse for court use.
 - Vacate Tulelake City Hall Facility.
- Option #3 – Maximum Consolidation
 - Abandon Yreka and Weed facilities. Construct new 6-courtroom facility between Yreka and Weed.
 - Vacate Tulelake City Hall facility.
 - Provide new small satellite hearing room facility in Happy Camp.

Comments:

- Dan Smith – The County will most likely not see much growth, however any growth they do see will happen in Weed and Mt. Shasta.

Actions:

- Option # 3 Review potential to abandon the Yreka facility and leave the jail there?
- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review

San Benito County (Presented by Kathleen Halaszynski)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- San Benito County Courthouse
 - Physical rating for the facility was 44.65% or Marginal.
 - Functional rating for the facility was 18.75% or Deficient.

Under the current use all three courtrooms were found to be deficient. The result was a shortfall of three courtrooms for the current use.

Overall space required for the current use is 25,086 square feet. Considering only adequate space, there is a shortfall of 21,136 square feet for the current need. Considering both marginal and adequate space there is a shortfall of 19,192 square feet.

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth
 - Caseload projected to grow from 7,098 to 14,017 by the year 2020.
 - Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 2.3 to 2.7 over the same horizon.
- Geography: Moderately sized county
- Commitment to access to courts
- Rapid growth in the county

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Build a new facility on a new site.
- Option #2 – Renovate and expand the existing facility.
(re-use the historical courthouse and add 2 new courtrooms)
- Option #3 – Partial Demolition and Expansion

Comments:

- Sheriff Robert Doyle – Option # 3 (partial demolition) needs to be explained in more detail.

Actions:

- Add to Option # 1 “with all in-custody capable courtrooms”.
- Expand upon the detail for Option #3.
- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review

San Francisco County (Presented by Kathleen Halaszynski)

The key facilities evaluated include:

- San Francisco Civic Courthouse (including the Polk St. Annex)
 - Physical rating for the facility was 98.85% or Adequate.
 - Functional rating for the facility was 81.5% or Adequate.
- San Francisco Hall of Justice
 - Physical rating for the facility was 43.21% or Marginal.
 - Functional rating for the facility was 68.75% or Marginal.
- San Francisco Youth Guidance Center

- Physical rating for the facility was 48.34% or Marginal.
- Functional rating for the facility was 43.75% or Deficient.

Under the current use, thirty-seven courtrooms were found to be adequate, thirty-one to be marginal, and six were found to be deficient. The result was a shortfall of six courtrooms based on adequate and marginal current use facilities.

Overall space required for the current use is 500,662 square feet. Considering only adequate space, there is a shortfall of 285,009 square feet for the current need. Considering both marginal and adequate space there is a shortfall of 192,121 square feet.

The key facilities evaluated include:

The key planning issues considered include:

- Projected Growth
 - Caseload projected to grow from 176,343 to 241,801 by the year 2020.
 - Judicial FTE's projected to increase from 64 to 79.5 over the same horizon.

The consultant team presented the following planning options to the committee:

- Option #1 – Build New Family Law Center;
Renovate and Expand Juvenile Courts;
Expand Civil Courtrooms onto 4th floor
Expand Hall of Justice
- Option #2 – Build New Family Law Center
Replace/Expand Juvenile Courts
Expand Civil Courtrooms onto 4th floor (Add 1 courtroom)
Build a new Criminal Courts Building
- Option #3 – Build New Multi-function Courts building
Replace/Expand Juvenile Courts
Expand Civil Courtrooms onto 4th floor and into probate space on 4th floor

Comments:

- Hon. Michael Nail – A key deficiency problem with the Hall of Justice is the movement of in-custody defendants through the private corridor. Could these be solved with an operational change. For example locking down the corridor during movement.
- Kathleen Halaszynski – Due to the distance of travel and the number of spaces that would be affected this does not seem like a viable option.
- Hon. Michael Nail – Cost to renovate does not seem realistic. How do you justify the cost when only the county had a shortfall of only six courtrooms.

Action:

- Refine option #2 to included the new Family Law Center to be located at the Juvenile Courts side.
- Describe how moving Family Court out of the Civil Building creates space for four additional Civil courtrooms in that building.
- Get the Master Plan for the Juvenile expansion from San Francisco.
- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review

IV. CLOSING REMARKS

Sheriff Doyle called the meeting to a close at approximately 11:10am.